

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF UTAH

FILED
U.S. DISTRICT COURT
2011 DEC 19 A 9:15

DISTRICT OF UTAH

THOMAS A. MONTANO,
Plaintiff,

v.

SALT LAKE COUNTY JAIL STAFF et al.,
Defendants.

BY: CLERK
ORDER GRANTING MOTIONS TO
AMEND COMPLAINT;
MEMORANDUM DECISION

Case No. 2:11-CV-174 DS

District Judge David Sam

Plaintiff, Thomas A. Montano, an inmate at Utah State Prison, filed this *pro se* civil rights suit. See 42 U.S.C.S. § 1983 (2011). The Court grants Plaintiff's motions to amend his complaint.

Instructions to Plaintiff

Under Rule 8 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure a complaint is required to contain "(1) a short and plain statement of the grounds upon which the court's jurisdiction depends, . . . (2) a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief, and (3) a demand for judgment for the relief the pleader seeks." Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a). The requirements of Rule 8(a) are intended to guarantee "that defendants enjoy fair notice of what the claims against them are and the grounds upon which they rest." *TV Commc'ns Network,*

Inc. v. ESPN, Inc., 767 F. Supp. 1062, 1069 (D. Colo. 1991),
aff'd, 964 F.2d 1022 (10th Cir. 1992).

Pro se litigants are not excused from compliance with the minimal pleading requirements of Rule 8. "This is so because a pro se plaintiff requires no special legal training to recount the facts surrounding his alleged injury, and he must provide such facts if the court is to determine whether he makes out a claim on which relief can be granted." *Hall v. Bellmon*, 935 F.2d 1106, 1009 (10th Cir. 1991). Moreover, "it is not the proper function of the Court to assume the role of advocate for a pro se litigant." *Id.* at 1110. Thus, the Court cannot "supply additional facts, [or] construct a legal theory for plaintiff that assumes facts that have not been pleaded." *Dunn v. White*, 880 F.2d 1188, 1197 (10th Cir. 1989).

Plaintiff should consider the following points before refiling his complaint. First, the revised complaint must stand entirely on its own and shall not refer to, or incorporate by reference, any portion of any past complaint. See *Murray v. Archambo*, 132 F.3d 609, 612 (10th Cir. 1998) (stating amended complaint supercedes original). Second, the complaint must clearly state what each individual defendant did to violate Plaintiff's civil rights. See *Bennett v. Passic*, 545 F.2d 1260, 1262-63 (10th Cir. 1976) (stating personal participation of each

named defendant is essential allegation in civil rights action). "To state a claim, a complaint must 'make clear exactly who is alleged to have done what to whom.'" *Stone v. Albert*, No. 08-2222, slip op. at 4 (10th Cir. July 20, 2009) (unpublished) (emphasis in original) (quoting *Robbins v. Oklahoma*, 519 F.3d 1242, 1250 (10th Cir. 2008)). Third, Plaintiff cannot name someone as a defendant based solely on his or her supervisory position. See *Mitchell v. Maynard*, 80 F.3d 1433, 1441 (10th Cir. 1996) (stating supervisory status alone is insufficient to support liability under § 1983). And, fourth, Plaintiff is warned that litigants who have had three *in forma pauperis* cases dismissed as frivolous or meritless will be restricted from filing future lawsuits without prepaying fees.

ORDER

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:


(1) Plaintiff's motions to amend his complaint are GRANTED. (See Docket Entry #s 11, 13, & 23.)

(2) Plaintiff shall have thirty days from the date of this order to amend his complaint; and,

(3) the Clerk's Office shall mail Plaintiff a copy of the
Pro Se Litigant Guide.

DATED this 19th day of December, 2011.

BY THE COURT:



JUDGE DAVID SAM
United States District Court